

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-2 have been amended. Claims 3-6 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 7-17 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-2 and 7-17 now are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Epinions, www.epinions.com, October 12, 1999 (“Epinions”) in view of Boulton et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,537,618 (“Boulton”).

Epinions discloses allowing consumers “to write about products [they] love or hate . . . [and they] get to *rate the usefulness of anyone’s opinion*” (page 8; emphasis provided). Epinions further discloses “*depend[ing] on members . . . to rate the opinions and to ensure that consumers get the most useful and honest information that they need*” (pages 8; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites, “ providing an interactive element associated with each of the displayed reviews on the client display, which when clicked by a user, indicates that the user has found a displayed review associated with a product/service helpful in determining whether or not to purchase or use the product/service . . . receiving at the database an indication that the user has clicked the interactive element, and incrementing a count of a stored number of indications for the review (1) in response to the indication and (2) if the stored number of indications does not exceed one indication for the review from the user” (emphasis provided).

First, Epinions *relies on its members to rate the opinions by having the members*

write about the opinions (see page 8). Epinions does not teach or reasonably suggest employing an interactive element for the user to click to indicate the user has found a displayed review helpful, as recited by claim 1. Epinions, instead, discloses relying entirely on consumers to input their ratings and does not teach or reasonably suggest the interactivity relating to submitting of such ratings using an interactive element, as recited by claim 1.

Second, the reliance of Epinions on users to input their ratings also promotes, for example, artificial inflation of the appearance of helpfulness of various opinions. For example, a user can input several ratings relating to an opinion to inflate the helpfulness of that opinion, and Epinions discloses no mechanism for monitoring, controlling, or stopping these multiple and/or artificial ratings. Epinions does not teach or reasonably suggest incrementing a count of a number of indications for the review (1) in response to the indication and (2) if the stored number of indications does not exceed one indication for the review from the user, as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Boulton, as acknowledged by the Examiner, discloses a “*central storage* location for reviews” (Office Action, mailed March 12, 2004, page 3; see Abstract, col. 5, lines 20-23, col. 10, line 61-col. 11, line 42). Boulton, like Epinions, does not teach or reasonably suggest an interactive element or incrementing a count of a number of indications for the review (1) in response to the indication and (2) if the stored number of indications does not exceed one indication for the review from the user, as recited by claim 1. Hence, Boulton adds nothing relevant to Epinions, at least, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent

claims be withdrawn.

With regard to new independent claims 9 and 14, they contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 14 and their dependent claims are distinguished from the cited references.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Epinions in view of Boulton and further in view of Newswire @Home, Netscape, Yahoo! Veterans Announce epinions.com (“@Home”).

Applicant submits that @Home is simply a “[Public Relations] PR Newswire” to announce the “true name, financing, and product plan” for Epinions (page 1, first paragraph, and line 2 following the Title). Epinions, Boulton, and @Home, neither individually nor when combined, teach or reasonably suggest an interactive element or incrementing a count of a number of indications for the review (1) in response to the indication and (2) if the stored number of indications does not exceed one indication for the review from the user, as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

With regard to new independent claims 9 and 14, they contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 14 and their dependent claims are distinguished from the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be allowed.